

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, December 18, 2017, 3:30 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS: Sup. Andy Nicholson – Chair, Corday Goddard – Vice Chair, Tom Diedrick, Ann Hartman and John Fenner

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Stephanie Schmutzer, Pat Leifker, Matt Roberts, David Wouters, David Pietenpol, Noel Halvorsen, Scott Schoeneman, Erik Hoyer and Bill Paape

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the November 20, 2017, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

T. Diedrick made a correction to the minutes, stating his name was misspelled throughout.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by A. Hartman to approve the minutes from the November 20, 2017, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

REPORTS:

2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program:
 - A. Preliminary Applications
For the Month of November, there were 102 preliminary applications.
 - B. Unit Count
The unit count for November was 3,028.
 - C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses
The November HAP expense totaled \$1,366,787.
 - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
There were a total of 393 inspections, of which 206 passed the initial inspection, 69 passed the re-inspection, 86 resulted in a fail and 32 were no shows.
 - E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)
There were 364 vouchers that ported out with a HAP expense of \$324,996; ICS was underspent by \$1,345.15 and the FSS program was overspent by \$5.71.
 - F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, participation levels, new contracts, graduates, escrow accounts and homeownership)
There were 79 active FSS clients, with 45 in level one, 16 in level two, 11 in level three and seven in level four. There were zero new contracts signed, zero graduates, 42 active escrow accounts and 50 homeowners.

G. VASH Reports (new VASH and active VASH)

There were three new VASH clients for a total of 28 active VASH clients.

H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

There were no new investigations assigned. Zero investigations were closed, 15 remain active, and one new application was approved in Green Bay.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick and seconded by A. Hartman to receive and place on file the Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

3. Consideration with possible action to award Project Based Vouchers to NeighborWorks® Green Bay and Ecumenical Partnership for Housing.

R. Hallet shared that staff was approved to post a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Project Based Vouchers (PBV) in October. Two proposals were submitted: one from NeighborWorks® Green Bay and one from Ecumenical Partnership for Housing (EPH). A selection committee reviewed the proposals, and ranked them. Though this is a competitive process, the Authority can choose both, neither, or just one of the applications. The committee is recommending both for approval.

NeighborWorks® currently has 122 units that are under Project Based Vouchers. Their proposal indicated that they would like to remove 16 of their current units and add 53 to the Project Based Vouchers Program. The committee recommended that the existing units, minus the 16 proposed to be removed, be approved, and that, of the 53 additional units, only the ones that are not located in high poverty areas be approved, which came to 18 units. NeighborWorks® then countered back that two of their apartment complexes, one located on Webster and the other on Phoebe & Lincoln, have some floating units added to the program.

C. Renier-Wigg stated that adding some of these units to the Project Based Voucher Program would be a great opportunity for deconcentrating poverty in the downtown Green Bay area.

A. Nicholson inquired about the difference between tenant based vouchers and project based vouchers. R. Hallet stated that tenant based vouchers are attached to the tenant, so that the tenant can use that voucher at any accepting rental unit. These can be ported out if the tenant decides to move. Project based vouchers are attached to a particular address and are not ported out. Tenants in project based units may convert to a tenant based voucher after living in the project based unit for at least one year if the PHA has tenant based vouchers available and then once the tenant has a tenant based voucher, they could port out if they so choose.

The Authority then discussed EPH's application.

R. Hallet stated that EPH proposed 12 units to become project based. These units are all single family homes or duplexes. EPH would like to make four of their already existing properties project based and the remaining eight *future* units, which they plan to purchase in the upcoming two years, be project based as well. The committee recommended approving the four existing

units, and restricting the proposed future eight units to be in locations that are not high poverty areas. R. Hallet shared a map illustrating which areas are impoverished and which are not.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Diedrick to open up the floor. Motion carried.

Noel Halvorsen and David Pietenpol represented NeighborWorks® and EPH, respectively. They reiterated some of their requests and thanked the Authority for the opportunity to help those experiencing poverty to become self-sufficient.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by J. Fenner to close the floor. Motion carried.

A. Nicholson shared reservations about the additional 35 units being requested by NeighborWorks® because he did not want the units concentrated in Green Bay.

N. Halvorsen stated that he would be willing to only propose units outside of Green Bay as a requirement should his proposal be awarded.

The Authority discussed that they would need to obtain more information from Corporation Counsel to add this stipulation to the RFP.

R. Hallet summarized that the proposal is to approve NeighborWorks® for 131 Project Based units, which would consist of 106 units that are currently Project Based, 18 newly requested units, plus 3 floating units on Webster and 4 floating units on Lincoln and Phoebe.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by J. Fenner to award NeighborWorks® 131 project based vouchers. Motion carried.

It was clarified that additional units that NeighborWorks® may wish to propose in lieu of those not recommended for approval would need to be brought back to the Authority for approval at a later time.

Discussion then switched to EPH's proposal. It was reiterated that EPH's request is for 12 PBV, four on units they currently own, none of which have previously been project based. C. Renier-Wigg suggested these units be treated similarly to NeighborWorks®, in that the four could be approved now and EPH could come back to request approval for other units, provided they are outside of the City of Green Bay.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by C. Goddard to accept Ecumenical Partnership for Housing's request for four Project Based vouchers. Motion carried.

4. Consideration with possible action to extend NeighborWorks® Green Bay's existing Project Based Voucher contracts, if not awarded in above agenda item.

This item is no longer needed since the Project Based Vouchers were approved above. A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by A. Hartman to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

5. Consideration with possible action on approval to changes to Chapter 17 (Project Based Vouchers) of the Administrative Plan.

R. Hallet stated that Chapter 17 pertains to Project Based Vouchers. EPH serves homeless individuals exiting shelters and transitional housing. They are requesting a separate waiting list for their Project Based Vouchers so they can continue to serve this population. A similar separate waiting list already exists for veterans at Veteran's Manor.

A. Nicholson expressed he wasn't in support of this since it wasn't included in the above discussion. His opinion is to keep everything the same.

A. Hartman asked how this would affect EPH. R. Hallet explained this would affect EPH's mission because their mission is to serve homeless families.

R. Hallet explained this request was included in EPH's proposal and was intentionally held as a separate agenda item. She further indicated that without allowing for a separate waiting list, all families applying for PBV would also be applying for EPH's units; the majority of such families would not be homeless and thus would not fit EPH's mission.

R. Hallet explained the BCHA already allows this separate waiting list for Veteran's Manor, which has residency criteria specifically for veterans. This request is similar but instead of veterans, would be for homeless families exiting shelters.

A. Hartman asked if EPH requested in the RFP to have a separate waiting list. R. Hallet responded yes. A. Nicholson said this wasn't mentioned in the earlier agenda item because R. Hallet stated she didn't want to complicate matters. A. Nicholson opined that this would have been an important point to consider earlier.

A. Hartman asked if by approving the four units for EPH, did that include approval of the separate waiting list? R. Hallet responded no.

C. Goddard clarified that this change would not provide for a secret list; rather, it's providing a special list for homeless families, just as how a special list currently exists for veterans.

A. Nicholson expressed that he understands, but he's not going to support it. He doesn't agree with it.

A. Hartman inquired if non-veterans can live at Veteran's Manor. R. Hallet explained her understanding is that for both Veteran's Manor and EPH, if there were no other applicants, they would accept applicants who do not meet the residency criteria.

A. Nicholson stated his impression was that Veteran's Manor was for veterans only. A. Hartman reiterated that veterans are served first; then they can open it up to non-veterans rather than leaving a unit vacant. A. Hartman inquired if Veteran's Manor has a waiting list; others present responded they do.

R. Hallet stated this topic isn't something she was intentionally withholding; anyone on the selection committee could vouch that EPH made it clear in their proposal that their mission is to serve homeless families.

A. Nicholson interjected, saying he felt this was a major point that should have been pointed out sooner. He stated the commissioners have fulltime jobs and are volunteers and need as much information as possible because they forget. R. Hallet stated that selection committee members

are chosen to review the details of the proposals so that each commissioner doesn't have to. A. Nicholson asked if he had seen the proposals. R. Hallet responded no because he was not on the selection committee. A. Nicholson stated that as the chairman it would have been nice if he could have been briefed on the basics of it. R. Hallet responded that is what she did at the beginning of this agenda item.

A Hartman asked if EPH's mission would suffer without this. R. Hallet stated a conversation with D. Pietenpol would be needed to determine how this would be addressed if not approved. A. Nicholson suggested he could be involved and could address it with D. Pietenpol.

N. Halvorsen offered that this change might not be necessary today and perhaps it could be tabled until there's a chance to talk to D. Pietenpol. A. Nicholson suggested this be held until the next meeting.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by A. Nicholson to hold until the next meeting.

T. Diedrick expressed approving this wouldn't hurt anything and that he wants to see homeless people getting priorities. He would support this.

A. Hartman inquired if homeless people already have a priority on the HCV program. C. Goddard emphasized that the focus here is on homeless families, that Green Bay does not have many resources for homeless families. He interjected that he has worked with EPH before, so advised commissioners to take that into account. He explained that this is a group of churches willing to do that work that we are not doing, so we should get out of their way. If there are other organizations willing to do the work that we will not do to serve the community, we should get out of their way. He doesn't think this would mess anything up. A. Nicholson disagreed, stating he is an alderman and it's not a good idea to get out of someone's way. C. Goddard stated that the City then should step up and do what needs to be done; if things are not being done, someone has to do it.

A. Nicholson expressed that he believes that the City of Green Bay has already made strides to address homelessness. For example, the City allowed St. John the Evangelist to open a homeless shelter. He stated he hasn't seen other communities in Brown County except Green Bay take leadership on this issue.

C. Goddard stated he believes that, but reiterated there are not adequate services for homeless families. As a community, we could be doing more, but we are not. EPH is an organization that is offering to do it.

A. Hartman inquired what the benefits would be to making this change. T. Diedrick stated that the only people EPH will take are homeless families; anyone else who applies would not be eligible. N. Halvorsen clarified that without this, the next PBV applicant on the list would have to go into an EPH unit. B. Paape explained that the fundraising EPH does is for the specific mission of serving homeless families, so that is in part the reason for the importance of this. A. Nicholson stated he understands.

J. Fenner stated that he would support this proposal.

A vote was taken on the motion on the floor. A. Hartman and A. Nicholson voted aye; C. Goddard, T. Diedrick and J. Fenner voted nay. Motion was denied.

A motion was made by T. Diedrick and seconded by C. Goddard to accept the proposed changes to Chapter 17.

A. Nicholson stated that he would not accept the motion as the chairman of the BCHA. He stated that he believes, as an officer of the City, we should talk to D. Pietenpol. C. Goddard inquired about the technicalities of A. Nicholson serving as an officer of the City on the BCHA Board. A. Nicholson stated he didn't know if there was a technicality, but he is there to protect the City and he needs answers. He stated that he wasn't aware of this stipulation when the previous agenda item was passed. R. Hallet interjected stating that this item was on the agenda, which he received on Friday. A. Nicholson said he knows, but he overlooked it.

A. Nicholson stated that as chairman, he's not going to entertain the motion. J. Fenner stated he doesn't believe he has that authority. A. Nicholson stated he does. J. Fenner pointed out that A. Nicholson just put forward that he is an Alderman of the City of Green Bay and he doesn't believe he has the authority to use that at a Brown County Housing Authority commission. He doesn't believe it's in order for A. Nicholson to use his aldermanic position to stop a motion.

A. Nicholson acknowledged J. Fenner's point. A. Nicholson stated that if he doesn't accept the motion, it goes back on the agenda for the next meeting.

J. Fenner inquired why T. Diedrick's motion can't be recognized. A. Nicholson responded he can refuse to recognize it as the BCHA chairman. J. Fenner again inquired why, to which A. Nicholson responded it is according to Robert's Rules of Order and that it's because he wants more information. J. Fenner stated that there are three of them in support of this motion and because A. Nicholson didn't read the agenda should not be a valid reason for the rest not to vote on this. A. Nicholson reiterated it is because he would like more information and the meeting will move forward and this item will be placed on the next meeting's agenda. J. Fenner stated an objection to A. Nicholson's ability to deny the motion. A. Nicholson acknowledged J. Fenner's objection and moved on to the next agenda item.

6. Consideration with possible action regarding BCHA joining the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay and other interested Housing Authorities in Brown County to conduct a county-wide Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) assessment.

R. Hallet stated that housing authorities are required to conduct an Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing assessment to determine needs of fair housing. She is requesting that the BCHA join a local consortium, which will publish an RFP allowing contractors in the area to submit proposals to conduct this AFFH process. Costs will be determined by the proposals and then will be split among the members of the consortium.

Likely members of the consortium, in addition to the BCHA, would include the City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority, the Green Bay Housing Authority and the De Pere Housing Authority. NEWCAP and WHEDA were also invited to participate. Pulaski Housing Authority has opted not to be included due to cost.

A. Hartman inquired about the potential costs of this assessment.

R. Hallet stated that Sheboygan County recently published an RFP and received two proposals with amounts of \$32,000 and \$45,000. Based on the size of Brown County, R. Hallet estimated that the total cost may be around \$60,000, split between the consortium members. So the BCHA's portion may be about \$20,000.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Deidrick to approve of the BCHA joining the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay and other interested Housing Authorities in Brown County to conduct a county-wide Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) assessment. Motion carried.

7. Consideration with possible action on BCHA budget and Resolution 17-03.

R. Hallet stated that this agenda item was discussed at the November meeting, at which time further information was requested. R. Hallet shared a summary of each of the changes in the budget. She then walked the Authority through each of these changes.

R. Hallet and S. Schmutzer answered some questions that were received regarding the budget.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by J. Fenner to approve the BCHA budget and Resolution 17-03. Motion carried.

BILLS AND FINANCIAL REPORT:

8. Consideration with possible action on acceptance of BCHA bills.

S. Schmutzer shared that a payment was made to NeighborWorks® for down payment and closing costs that were approved at a previous meeting. Additionally, some legal fees and staff training bills also came in.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by T. Deidrick to accept the BCHA bills. Motion carried.

9. Consideration with possible action on acceptance of BCHA financial report.

S. Schmutzer stated that nothing out of the ordinary was on the financial report. She stated that the Authority might see this document again with the end of the year wrap-up.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by T. Deidrick to accept the BCHA financial report. Motion carried.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT AND INFORMATIONAL:

Schedule of BCHA Meetings for 2018

R. Hallet pointed out that the April and September meeting dates were changed due to staff scheduling conflicts.

Date of next meeting: January 15, 2018

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by J. Fenner to adjourn at 4:50 p.m. Motion carried.

LNC: RAH